



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

there is eternal right; there is keeping faith beyond the strict law when you give your word; there is gentleness and there is mercy."

It is time that this "something higher" should show itself in the national legislature in reference to the Chinamen, whose patience and forbearance and good behavior have put to shame our selfishness and exclusiveness. If any restriction of Chinese immigration is necessary, which we very much doubt, let it be made in an honorable, American way. We are certainly not so far along in the stages of moral decline that this is impossible.

HAWAII.

It is impossible not to think and speak about the Hawaiian situation, difficult as it is, on account of the distance and the conflicting statements coming from different sources, to sift out the truth and say what is right. The problem is made all the more difficult by the number of questions involved in it, distinct to a certain extent and yet all closely bound together. What is best for Hawaii itself, in view of conditions existing there for some years past? Was the revolution inevitable and certain to succeed? Did the United States officials there interfere unduly during the progress of the revolution? What course should this country have pursued when asked to annex the islands? Is the proposal of the President and Secretary Gresham to use at least the moral force of the United States to restore the monarchy required by justice or is it unjustifiable on any theory which has been put forth as to the aid given the revolutionists by ex-Minister Stevens and Captain Wiltse? All these questions must be answered by one who would give a satisfactory solution of the problem raised, and the answers to some of them are greatly dependent on those given to the others.

As to the first question, there is very little difference of opinion. It is conceded by nearly all that the monarchy was rotten, and that it was determined to make things worse by the proposed new constitution which was to disfranchise the very best citizens of the islands, men who, though of foreign birth or of foreign descent, were as truly citizens of the country as any native Hawaiian. These men whose permanent home was there, who owned nine-tenths of the property and paid nine-tenths of the taxes, were to be sacrificed by a monarch who was notoriously corrupt and who sought to legalize the lottery and the opium den. This course of things, which for years had gone from bad to worse, made a revolution in the country not only inevitable but certainly morally justifiable. A Government of whatever sort is the servant of the people and has no right to exist when it ceases to serve their interests and deliberately plans the destruction of their rights. That a change in the Hawaiian Government was necessary and that a republic was the

only form that could meet the real wants of the nation is doubted by very few on American soil.

From all that has been said and written by those now on the islands and by those who have been there as public officials and as private persons, it seems clear to us that the revolution was sure to have come about and ultimately to have succeeded, even if no United States gunboats had been within five thousand miles of the islands. There is little doubt, to be sure, that the presence of the United States officials and forces gave encouragement to the revolutionists, as did those of other nations whose representatives so quickly recognized the provisional Government when once in power. But there is no reason to believe that the presence of the United States marines in any way materially affected the outcome of the revolution, whatever may be true as to the time or purpose of their landing. The result was sure to have come, the revolution being forced into existence by the corrupt purposes of the Queen and her minions, too inefficient, it seems, to know how to plan effectively to carry out their designs or to oppose the uprising against them.

As to the third question, the answer is by no means easy. Mr. Blount says there was undue interference, nay more, that there was a positive conspiracy to which the United States officials were parties, and that the provisional Government was really set up by the unlawful use of the United States forces. He supports this position by certain documentary evidence and by testimony taken in the island which on its face seems to make out a good case. This evidence has convinced President Cleveland and Secretary Gresham, and has led to the sending out of Minister Willis with instructions to make good the wrong done, by restoring Queen Liliuokalani to the throne, explicit instruction being given, however, not to use force until report should be made and further instructions received from Washington. This view of the matter of interference is further supported by ex-Secretary Foster's reproof to ex-Minister Stevens, for having acted too hastily. It must be remembered, however, that Mr. Foster's judgment was based upon Mr. Stevens' own report, and that the reproof was not for unlawfully supporting the revolution but simply for over-haste in doing his duty. Mr. Stevens, who had been for a considerable time in Honolulu and was an actor in the events, denies, in toto, that there was any interference or conspiracy, and says that the sole purpose of landing the United States troops was for the protection of the life and property of American citizens in case of a conflict, and that this landing was not made until the provisional Government was actually in power. He gives particulars as to days, hours and places, which he declares himself ready to go before any proper tribunal and bear testimony to. His statements are corroborated by Hawaiian Minister Thurston and by the letters of missionaries in the islands. It is difficult to see how these statements of eye-witnesses

can be false, unless we suppose downright lying on their part. This we are loath to do, and are inclined, therefore, for the present to accept their version as substantially correct, since it harmonizes better with the general condition of things in the islands and with what United States officials might have been expected to do.

This does not require us to assume that Mr. Blount, President Cleveland and Secretary Gresham had consciously predetermined to find Mr. Stevens and Captain Wiltse guilty of overstepping their authority, nor that they were moved chiefly by party hostility to the previous administration, as has been openly charged in so many journals. But Mr. Blount was only a single individual, he was not in the islands when the events happened, he did not examine many of those who were prominent eye witnesses, no cross-examination was made, it seems, of his witnesses, and every one knows that in an excited series of events many things happen which can easily be interpreted by one mind in one way and by another in another. It is serious business to charge a Minister with base and wicked motives unless his conduct can be accounted for in no other way. The course of things in the islands since Mr. Willis arrived there indicates that Mr. Blount, for some reason, failed to find out the real facts and the state of feeling as to the deposed Queen. It would have been indefinitely better if a Commission of three or more disinterested persons had been sent to Hawaii instead of a single Commissioner, and that they should have been sent by the Senate rather than by the President alone. It may yet be advisable, considering the muddle into which the affair has come, for such a Commission to be sent out, when Congress meets again.

This leads us to the fourth point. When the Hawaiian Commissioners first came to Washington, after the revolution, asking for annexation, a Commission of inquiry ought to have been sent out at once. The matter of annexing a nation, even if not a very large one, was too important to be rushed through without due consideration. The effort to get through the Senate a treaty of annexation before the country had sufficient time to find out the merits of the case, was, as we then said, very unwise. This first mistake is the cause in part of the confusion and tangle into which the affair has unfortunately fallen.

But even supposing Mr. Blount was right as to the conduct of Mr. Stevens and Captain Wiltse, were President Cleveland and Secretary Gresham justified in the course they have taken? We think not. The country was greatly astonished, almost regardless of party, when the proposed course of restoration was made known. It was taken, at first, as a practical declaration of war against the provisional Government, and if it was not a mere feint on the part of the President, it remains to be virtually such, for it must have been perfectly clear from the first that the provisional Government would not give way unless the use of the United States military was under-

stood to be implied. The United States had recognized the provisional Government, and this recognition has never been withdrawn. It was likewise recognized by all the other powers. Mr. Willis bore credentials to this same Government, the only one in the islands. It is a curious position to be in, to hold a Government in recognition and to be sending ministers to it, and at the same time deliberately planning its overthrow. But, further, no injustice has been done to the ex-Queen which it is necessary to right. She had forfeited the right to rule. Her person has been protected. She has been amply provided for pecuniarily. The new government was set up in the interests of righteousness and justice, and not in the interests of ambitious adventurers. Even if the United States officials, subordinate officers, in Hawaii had overstepped their authority and assisted in her dethronement, which does not appear to be the case, this would not justify the supreme executive authority of our country, without even consulting Congress, in doing a tenfold greater wrong by overthrowing a universally recognized and friendly Government, which has shown itself a strong and capable one even since the United States protectorate was withdrawn, and by restoring a corrupt and tyrannical monarchy. One wrong can never right another.

It seems at this writing that the plan of President Cleveland and Secretary Gresham is destined to signal failure. The Hawaiian Government shows no disposition to yield. Minister Willis has not been in a hurry to tell them what he came for. It is, at least it ought to be, impossible that United States bayonets should be used for the carrying out of the proposed restoration. The sentiment of this country will never tolerate it. The Republic is likely to be at once proclaimed in the Sandwich Islands, and we may hope that the unfortunate series of events will speedily come to a close.

Just as we are going to press the sad news reaches us of the sudden death of George Gillett of London. He was one of the most devoted and clear-sighted of the friends of peace. He had attended and taken a prominent part in all the recent peace congresses in Europe and was prevented from being at Chicago only by his inability to make the long journey. He labored in many private and public ways for the promotion of the cause of peace, in whose ultimate triumph he had the most unwavering confidence. He was one of the founders of the "Christian Union for promoting International Concord," whose chairman is the distinguished Bishop of Durham. He was one of the Honorary Secretaries of the Union and, if we remember rightly, was chiefly instrumental in founding *The Messiah's Kingdom*, published under its auspices. One of the chief characteristics of George Gillett's public work was his reliance upon God, his spirit of confiding prayer, his sincere belief in the Lord's overruling providences, working surely for ultimate righteousness and peace among the nations.